## **EXHIBIT A**

K1TMAVEVD1

24

25

to be released, so there isn't a value to it. They don't even

know if they are going to release it to begin with.

1	THE COURT: That's why you're testing it?
2	JUROR: Exactly.
3	THE COURT: You tell them whether you like it or not?
4	JUROR: Absolutely.
5	THE COURT: Did you also tell me that you had applied
6	for a job at Nike? Refresh my memory of any other contact you
7	had with Nike other than getting this merchandise and giving
8	them reviews of it.
9	JUROR: Absolutely. Six, seven years ago I had been
10	on their campus. I've been to their employee store. I wasn't
11	working for them. But the team I was working with was
12	affiliated with Nike.
13	THE COURT: What kind of team was that?
14	JUROR: This was the Major League Soccer team, the
15	Portland Timbers in Oregon.
16	THE COURT: Were they sponsor of the team?
17	JUROR: No. Since they are already in the city, they
18	just had a connection. As far as applications, this was like
19	right when I graduated college I applied for a job there.
20	THE COURT: How many years ago was that?
21	JUROR: 2013, 2014, I believe.
22	THE COURT: What kind of job were you looking for?
23	JUROR: Sales associate job for their store in the
24	Upper East Side.
25	THE COURT: Since that time, since you applied and

other than your review work for them where they give you products and you give them reviews of it, any other contact that you had with Nike over say the last six or seven years or essentially when you graduated from school?

JUROR: Not tied to the office, but to an employee, yes. Where almost a month ago I played at their New York City headquarters, played basketball there, and I'm playing there this Friday.

THE COURT: That's through a friend that you have who works at the company?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: That's what gives you access to their facility?

JUROR: Absolutely.

THE COURT: Do the lawyers have additional questions they want to put to the juror?

MR. RICHENTHAL: Good afternoon.

In trying to become sales associate, do you take any steps to demonstrate why you think you could be a good sales associate, and if so, can you describe those to the lawyers and the Court?

JUROR: I did have an in-person interview. I did display like my admiration for the brand, for the products, my knowledge about it as well. But that's pretty much all I can remember.

THE COURT: Let me break in for a second because you 1 made reference to your admiration of the brand. Can you speak 2 3 to that for a minute. What is your view of the Nike brand? 4 JUROR: I've been a fan all my life. The reason I 5 have ties to those basketball players is because I was a 6 basketball player myself. I played varsity basketball for 7 three years, then played intramurals and have been using their products for pretty much all my life, yes. 8 9 THE COURT: I take it you have a high opinion of their 10 products? 11 JUROR: Yes. 12 MR. RICHENTHAL: Is your opinion grounded in your view 13 of their products or their culture or something else, if you 14 can expand? JUROR: Mixture of both. Definitely a fan of their 15 products. Their marketing as well. 16 17 MR. RICHENTHAL: Do you have that view of any other 18 athletic companies? 19 JUROR: That's a good question. Adidas a little bit 20 and Brooks. I'm a big fan of their running shoes. 21 MR. RICHENTHAL: Do you use products for all three 22 companies? 23 Adidas, not really. For Brooks, yes. 24 MR. RICHENTHAL: Have you ever posted publicly your

views of Nike or Adidas or Brooks?

JUROR: For Nike, yes, I have.

MR. RICHENTHAL: Can you tell us when and how that came about?

JUROR: Nike had this big marketing campaign where they were hosting run clubs. It was all free. And I was part of those run clubs. I would post on Instagram. This was from 2004 to 2015, just the year. I have stopped posting since.

MR. RICHENTHAL: Why have you stopped posting?

JUROR: They just don't do it anymore. They stopped it after about a year or so.

MR. RICHENTHAL: Is there anything about your view of Nike that you think would cause you, one way or another, to favor Mr. Avenatti or disfavor Mr. Avenatti with respect to the allegations in this case?

JUROR: Can you repeat that.

MR. RICHENTHAL: Is there anything about your view of Nike that would cause you to favor one party or disfavor one party with respect to the allegations in this case?

JUROR: No. I don't know Mr. Avenatti personally. I have not seen his face before this case has started. No.

MR. RICHENTHAL: What if there was a witness, for example, a lawyer, who might have represented Nike, would you think that you'd have a problem looking at that witness as the same as any other witness?

JUROR: No. No problem at all.

1 MR. RICHENTHAL: Are you confident in that? 2 JUROR: Yes. 3 MR. RICHENTHAL: Why are you confident in that, given 4 that you've said, and we appreciate your candor, that you use 5 Nike's properties and you admire the company? Can you explain 6 why you're confident? 7 JUROR: He is just a lawyer. Probably represents Nike and any other brand as well. He doesn't really have any close 8 9 ties to Nike. 10 MR. RICHENTHAL: Let me change the question slightly. 11 Imagine for a moment the person was not an outside lawyer but 12 in fact an employee of Nike itself. Would you nevertheless be 13 able to look at that witness like any other? 14 Absolutely. I have no ties whatsoever. JUROR: 15 MR. RICHENTHAL: Do you have any doubt about that, given your admiration for the company? 16 17 JUROR: No. No doubt. 18 MR. RICHENTHAL: Why? 19 JUROR: Again, I don't have any personal connection, 20 nor am I even applying for a job to Nike. I am not looking 21 towards Nike at all. A lot of my focus now is on tech. So do 22 I still have admiration for the company and the brand? Yes. 23 But if I had ties to the employees and admiration of the 24 employees, no.

THE COURT: Remind us what your occupation is, what it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is you're doing now.

JUROR: Yes. I'm an account manager for a company called ZeroCater. It's a corporate catering service here in the city.

THE COURT: And how long have you been doing that?

JUROR: Six months.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Could you tell us again what you did before that.

JUROR: Yes. Absolutely. I was working for -- I'm sorry. It's a tech startup in the city called Annie Moto.

They do video engineering. And I was doing similar work. Like client success, client support.

THE COURT: Other questions.

MR. QUINON: Good morning. Let me ask you this. You posted about the product Nike, did you not?

JUROR: Um-hum.

MR. QUINON: And how often were you posting?

JUROR: Yeah. They were hosting these run clubs for about maybe once or twice a week, give or take. They had others. But they would be at capacity. So I would be in like maybe one or two.

MR. QUINON: Where were you posting?

JUROR: Most times -- for the most part, it was Instagram. Actually, all the time, it was Instagram.

MR. QUINON: And the purpose of the posting was what,

to promote Nike?

JUROR: To promote Nike as well as the products.

MR. QUINON: So you're promoting the company as well as the products. That was the purpose?

JUROR: Sometimes they will give us free stuff, like a T-shirt, free bag, things like that.

MR. QUINON: But you understood that the idea that they are giving you the free product is for you to advance their economic interests?

JUROR: Absolutely. I recognize that.

MR. QUINON: And not only were you advancing their economic interests to some degree, even though you can't place a precise value on what you were receiving, you are receiving merchandise that was good for you to have, correct?

JUROR: Yeah.

MR. QUINON: Tell me a little bit more about this posting. You can tell by my age, I am not too familiar with this Internet stuff.

JUROR: No worries.

MR. QUINON: Tell me a little bit about frequency, and what was the latest that you've been posting?

JUROR: Well, the latest I've been posting, like outside of Nike or about Nike?

MR. QUINON: This is just about Nike. That's all we are talking, about Nike.

months in between?

I haven't posted any Nike stuff since that's 1 That ended like 2014, 2015, somewhere around there. 2 ended. MR. QUINON: Since 2014, '15, you have not posted 3 4 about Nike? 5 JUROR: Not at all. 6 MR. QUINON: And nothing about Nike products? 7 Not at all. Actually, for the testing, the products that I test, one of the specific rules to be 8 9 maintained as a tester, you cannot post on social media. 10 MR. QUINON: Just so I understand, the last posting 11 would have been '14, '15. 12 JUROR: Um-hum. 13 MR. QUINON: But since that time you have been 14 receiving products, correct? 15 JUROR: Yes. MR. QUINON: When you receive these products, are you 16 17 encouraged to share with friends and people about how you feel 18 about the product? JUROR: Doesn't specifically state it, but they also 19 20 don't tell us not to. I do share my knowledge and what I feel 21 about the product, but I do not post it publicly on social 22 media or any platforms. 23 MR. QUINON: The judge asked you were how often you 24 would receive it, and you said somewhere along the lines of

JUROR: Six, seven months, sometimes longer, but usually between six and seven months.

MR. QUINON: What kind of quantity do you get of these products?

JUROR: It's always like one piece. Whether it be a pair of shoes, pair of pants, or the latest one, which was two weeks ago, that I completed was just a jacket.

MR. QUINON: Let's say you get this jacket. What is the process for you? I suppose they want some feedback, right?

JUROR: Um-hum.

MR. QUINON: How do you arrange to give your feedback to them? How is that done?

JUROR: We have a platform. They have a website that I log into where I fill out daily sort of like a survey, and then at the end I give general feedback at the end of that survey. I do this each time I wear it. And that's pretty much it.

MR. QUINON: Essentially, every time you wear whatever apparel they give you, you have to report to them what you wore that day and where you wore it to? What do you report?

JUROR: Those two things. They want to report the length of time that I wore it because you have to hit a minimum of a certain amount of times that you wore it. And then they also want to know just my general feedback about the product.

MR. QUINON: They require you to wear it a certain

1 | amount of time?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 JUROR: Yes.

MR. QUINON: And the idea, I would think, is to wear it where there are more people, correct?

JUROR: Can you repeat it.

MR. QUINON: The idea would be for you to wear the product where people are going to see the product, correct?

JUROR: Again, in their rules, that's not stipulated. Again, they refrain from you to reporting at all publicly on any platforms that we are testing it. Yes, I do keep it to myself. If people see me wearing it and they ask me, I can give them my general feedback about it.

MR. QUINON: I'm almost done, so bear with me.

JUROR: Of course.

MR. QUINON: You mentioned before, when the judge asked you, that you had a great admiration for the company.

JUROR: Yes.

MR. QUINON: This is a case that deals with the company, and obviously we just want to make sure trying to find out where your mind is at. We can't see it. We depend on you. Would you feel more comfortable if this was a case that was not about Nike? Would that make you feel more comfortable to serve on a case where Nike would not be involved as it is in this case?

JUROR: That's a good question. Do I have a general

curiosity about the case because of Nike? Yes. Does that affect my judgment or does that affect the way I feel about Mr. Avenatti or anyone else involved in the case? No.

THE COURT: To put another way, are you capable of putting aside the contact you've had with Nike over the years, including the sneakers or the coat or the T-shirt they may have asked you to review? Can you set all of that aside and would you be capable of deciding the case based solely on the evidence that you would hear in the courtroom if you were selected to serve?

JUROR: Figuratively or literally.

THE COURT: I mean literally. It could even be in the back of your mind, your admiration of the company that you mentioned, your contact with the company, the merchandise that they have asked you to review every six or seven months. All of that. That has to go completely out of your mind. It can't be in the back of your mind. And you would have to decide the case not based on any of that, but, rather, solely on the basis of the evidence that you would seek in this courtroom.

JUROR: Just for clarification, do you mean just like refraining from testing the products or refraining from having any --

THE COURT: I'm talking more about your mind. I'm talking about your mind. The items that we have mentioned, the admiration that you've expressed for the company and their

K1TMAVEVD3

products and the fact that they have given you merchandise to review and that you have reviewed, and the contact you had back in 2014, 2015 with them. All of that has to be completely removed from your consciousness for purposes of deciding this case. It could not even be in the back of your mind, your feelings about the company and your prior contact. That has to be all removed, and you have to approach it strictly from what evidence have I heard in this courtroom during this trial. That has to be the basis for a decision. The question is, can you do that, given the contact you've had with Nike over the years?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Juror not present)

THE COURT: Does anyone want to say anything else?

MR RICHENTHAL: I think in our view, every human being is unique. Every potential juror is unique.

The government had a lot of concern about

Ms. McFadden. She was emotional when she gave answers. She

ultimately said she can be fair and impartial. This juror has

given the same answer, in my view. He has given this answer

more emphatically and he has given it repeatedly.

I think applying consistent principle, the defense would be perfectly within its rights to challenge and strike this juror peremptorily. But this juror has repeatedly not

just said that he can be fair and impartial, he has explained why, and he has explained.

THE COURT: You don't have to go on for three years about everything. Try to compress it. Otherwise, this trial is going to take a lot longer than it should.

Anything else you want to say? Tell me what your view is.

MR. STABILE: He has a direct relationship with the victim. That is extremely concerning. And he has posted in 2019 and 2018. He said it stopped in 2014, '15. That's, quite frankly, not accurate. And he has an ongoing relationship with them. He is at this time logging into their website, giving reviews on products at this very time.

THE COURT: I thought he said that he wasn't posting anything about them and hadn't done so since 2015.

MR. STABILE: Not posting. But as a product tester he said he has to go into their website. But he has posted in 2018, the one I pointed out to the government, and we found one from 2019. He is posting about attending a Nike event, talking about their spectacular office.

THE COURT: Do you agree with that?

MR. RICHENTHAL: I don't know enough about Twitter, but they look like re-Tweets.

THE COURT: Take a look at it.

MR. RICHENTHAL: If the juror is going to be asked to

struck for cause based on the date on a document, I think it's appropriate that the juror be shown the document.

THE COURT: I am going to strike him for cause. He has too many connections with Nike. There is just no reason to spend time on this anymore. There are too many connections that have gone on for too long, and we start from a proposition he is getting free merchandise from them and that's for a significant period of time. I am going to strike him for cause.

Now I have 39 people, which should be more than enough.

Any other challenges for cause?

MR. RICHENTHAL: Just for the record, your Honor, for the sake of this juror, since there is media attention to this case, I take it the Court is not making a finding that he was not candid, but merely making a finding --

THE COURT: No. My view of it is, most of the posting that he did was 2014 and 2015. He was totally up front and accurate about that. It may have been at some point over the years other postings or references to Nike have happened. No. I think he was candid. Almost all of it was 2014 and 2015. He explained what the context was. He struck me as a very conscientious person. I think he was trying to do his very level best. This is not in any way a comment on him. As I said at the outset, when they are excused, it's not a comment

about them.

Having said all that, there are too many connections between him and Nike such that I'm not comfortable with him being on the jury.

What I'd like to do now is tell the panel, we are going to break for lunch. I want you fellows to prepare your lists of peremptory challenges. I want to reconvene before the time I'm bringing the jury back to go through those peremptories, figure out who the 12 lowest numbered jurors are, and we will turn to alternates, complete the process so whenever it is I have the jury come back, we are all set and ready to go for openings.

MR. STABILE: Do you want our jury and alternate peremptory lists?

THE COURT: Not after lunch, no. Before the jury comes back.

The time now is 12:25. Is 1:30 going to be enough time?

MR. S. SREBNICK: It will be if we can meet
Mr. Avenatti here instead of in the lockup. It's not just
practical.

THE COURT: Can we stay in the courtroom?

THE MARSHAL: Yes. Absolutely, your Honor.

THE COURT: What I have in mind is 20 minutes and it's going to be a firm 20 minutes. I am going to come back here.

I am going to say I want your list of peremptory challenges. You are going to give them to me. We will figure out who the 12 lowest-numbered jurors are. Then I will say, give me your list of two for peremptories as to alternates. We will agree on the jury. When they come back at 1:30, if you tell me you think that's going to be enough time, we are ready to go with the openings.

Does that work?

MR. SOBELMAN: Your Honor, to clarify, we come back at 1:30 or they come back at 1:30?

THE COURT: I'll repeat it again. Twenty minutes from now I want your lists of peremptory challenges as to the members of the 12 who will make up the jury. And right after that I want you to give me your list of two, which are peremptory challenges as to the alternates. We will have completed that process by say half an hour from now. Then the lawyers and the panel will come back at 1:30. We will excuse everybody except those who have been chosen as the jury or the alternates, and then we will proceed with openings.

Really, the only open issue is what time should I tell them to come back. Is 1:30 doable or 1:45? 1:45, is that OK?

MR. PODOLSKY: Do you want names?

THE COURT: Names and numbers.

MR. PODOLSKY: Original number that we got at the beginning.